



# PLACER COUNTY PLANNING DEPARTMENT

11414 B Avenue/Auburn, California 95603/Telephone (530) 889-7470/FAX (530) 889-7499  
Web Page: <http://www.placer.ca.gov/planning> E-Mail: [ljlawren@placer.ca.gov](mailto:ljlawren@placer.ca.gov)

## INITIAL STUDY

*In accordance with the policies of the Placer County Board of Supervisors regarding implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act, this document, combined with the attached "Environmental Analysis" discussion form and supporting data, constitutes the Initial Study on the proposed project. This Initial Study provides the basis for the determination whether the project may have a significant effect on the environment. If it is determined that the project may have a significant effect on the environment, an Environmental Impact Report will be prepared which focuses on the areas of concern identified by this Initial Study.*

### I. BACKGROUND

Title of Project: **Forest Ranch**

EIAQ #3656

### II. EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

- A. A brief explanation is required for all answers except "No Impact" answers.
- B. "Less Than Significant Impact" applies where the project's impacts are negligible and do not require any mitigation to reduce impacts.
- C. "Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated" applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less than Significant Impact." The County, as lead agency, must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less-than-significant level (mitigation measures from Section IV, EARLIER ANALYSES, may be cross-referenced).
- D. "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect is significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.
- E. All answers must take account of the entire action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts [CEQA, Section 15063(1)].
- F. Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or Negative Declaration [Section 15063(c)(3)(D)]. Earlier analyses are discussed in Section IV at the end of the checklist.
- G. References to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans/community plans, zoning ordinances) should be incorporated into the checklist. Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should include a reference to the pages or chapters where the statement is substantiated. A source list should be attached, and other sources used, or individuals contacted, should be cited in the discussion.
- H. This checklist has been adapted from the form in Appendix I of the State CEQA Guidelines, as amended effective September 19, 1994.

## ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES

(see attachments for information sources)

No Impact	Less Than Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Potentially Significant Impact
-----------	------------------------------	--	--------------------------------

### 1. LAND USE AND PLANNING. Would the proposal:

- |   |                          |                                     |                          |                                     |
|---|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a. Conflict with general plan/community plan/specific plan designation(s) or zoning, or policies contained within such plans?                                     | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b. Conflict with applicable environmental plans or policies adopted by responsible agencies with jurisdiction over the project?                                   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| c. Be incompatible with existing land uses in the vicinity?   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| d. Affect agricultural and timber resources or operations (e.g., impacts to soils or farmlands and timber harvest plans, or impacts from incompatible land uses)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| e. Disrupt or divide the physical arrangement of an established community (including a low-income or minority community)?   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| f. Result in a substantial alteration of the present or planned land use of an area?  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

### 2. POPULATION AND HOUSING. Would the proposal:

- |   |                          |                                     |                          |                                     |
|---|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a. Cumulatively exceed official regional or local population projections?   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b. Induce substantial growth in an area either directly or indirectly (e.g., through projects in an undeveloped area or extension of major infrastructure)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| c. Displace existing housing, especially affordable housing?  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            |

### 3. GEOLOGIC PROBLEMS. Would the proposal result in or expose people to potential impacts involving:

- |  |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a. Unstable earth conditions or changes in geologic substructures?   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b. Significant disruptions, displacements, compaction or overcovering of the soil?   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| c. Substantial change in topography or ground surface relief features?   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| d. The destruction, covering or modification of any unique geologic or physical features?  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| e. Any significant increase in wind or water erosion of soils, either on or off the site?  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| f. Changes in deposition or erosion or changes in siltation which may modify the channel of a river, stream, or lake?  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| g. Exposure of people or property to geologic and geomorphological (i.e. avalanches) hazards such as earthquakes, landslides, mudslides, ground failure, or similar hazards? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

### 4. WATER. Would the proposal result in:

- |   |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a. Changes in absorption rates, drainage patterns, or the rate and amount of surface runoff?  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b. Exposure of people or property to water related hazards such as flooding?  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| c. Discharge into surface waters or other alterations of surface water quality (e.g., temperature, dissolved oxygen, or turbidity)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

- |  |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| d. Changes in the amount of surface water in any water body? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

**ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES**

*(see attachments for information sources)*

No Impact      Less Than Significant Impact      Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated      Potentially Significant Impact

- e. Changes in currents, or the course of direction of water movements?
- f. Change in the quantity of groundwater, either through direct additions of withdrawals, or through interception of an aquifer by cuts or excavations, or through substantial loss of groundwater recharge capability?
- g. Altered direction or rate of flow of groundwater?
- h. Impacts to groundwater quality?
- i. Substantial reduction in the amount of groundwater otherwise available for public water supplies?
- j. Impacts to the watershed of important surface water resources, including but not limited to, Lake Tahoe, Folsom Lake, Hell Hole Reservoir, Rock Creek Reservoir, Sugar Pine Reservoir, French Meadows Reservoir, Combie Lake, and Rollins Lake?

**5. AIR QUALITY.** Would the proposal:

- a. Violate any air quality standard or contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation?
- b. Expose sensitive receptors to pollutants?
- c. Have the potential to increase localized carbon monoxide levels at nearby intersections in exceedance of adopted standards?
- d. Create objectionable odors?

**6. TRANSPORTATION/CIRCULATION.** Would the proposal result in:

- a. Increased vehicle trips or traffic congestion?
- b. Hazards to safety from design features (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?
- c. Inadequate emergency access or access to nearby uses?
- d. Insufficient parking capacity on-site or off-site?
- e. Hazards or barriers for pedestrians or bicyclists?
- f. Conflicts with adopted policies supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?
- g. Rail, waterborne, or air traffic impacts?

**7. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES.** Would the proposal result in impacts to:

- a. Endangered, threatened or rare species or their habitats (including, but no limited to plants, fish, insects, animals, and birds)?
- b. Locally occurring natural communities (e.g., oak woodlands, mixed conifer, annual grasslands, etc.)?
- c. Significant ecological resources including:
  - 1) Wetland areas including vernal pools;
  - 2) Stream environment zones;
  - 3) Critical deer winter ranges (winter and summer),

**ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES**

*(see attachments for information sources)*

No Impact      Less Than Significant Impact      Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated      Potentially Significant Impact

- migratory routes and fawning habitat;
- 4) Large areas of non-fragmented natural habitat, including but not limited to Blue Oak Woodlands, Valley Foothill Riparian, vernal pool habitat;
- 5) Identifiable wildlife movement zones, including but not limited to, non-fragmented stream environment zones, avian and mammalian routes, and known concentration areas of waterfowl within the Pacific Flyway;
- 6) Important spawning areas for anadromous fish?

**8. ENERGY AND MINERAL RESOURCES.** Would the proposal :

- a. Conflict with adopted energy conservation plans?
- b. Use non-renewable resources in a wasteful and inefficient manner?
- c. Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of future value to the region and state residents?

**9. HAZARDS.** Would the proposal involve:

- a. A risk of accidental explosion or release of hazardous substances (including, but not limited to, oil, pesticides, chemicals, or radiation)?
- b. Possible interference with an emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?
- c. The creation of any health hazard or potential health hazard?
- d. Exposure of people to existing sources of potential health hazards?
- e. Increased fire hazard in areas with flammable brush, grass, or trees.?

**10. NOISE.** Would the proposal result in :

- a. Increases in existing noise levels?
- b. Exposure of people to noise levels in excess of County standards?

**11. PUBLIC SERVICES.** Would the proposal have an effect upon, or result in a need for new or altered government services, in any of the following areas:

- a. Fire Protection?
- b. Sheriff Protection?
- c. Schools?
- d. Maintenance of public facilities, including roads?
- e. Other governmental services?

**12. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS.** Would the proposal result in a need for new systems or supplies, or substantial alterations to the following utilities:

- a. Power or natural gas?
- b. Communication systems?
- c. Local or regional water treatment or distribution facilities?

**ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES**

*(see attachments for information sources)*

	No Impact	Less Than Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Potentially Significant Impact
d. Sewer, septic systems, or wastewater treatment and disposal facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e. Storm water drainage?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f. Solid waste materials recovery or disposal?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g. Local or regional water supplies?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**13. AESTHETICS.** Would the proposal:

a. Affect a scenic vista or scenic highway?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. Have a demonstrable negative aesthetic effect?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c. Create adverse light or glare effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**14. CULTURAL RESOURCES.** Would the proposal:

a. Disturb paleontological resources?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. Disturb archaeological resources?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c. Affect historical resources?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d. Have the potential to cause a physical change which would affect unique ethnic cultural values?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e. Restrict existing religious or sacred uses within the potential impact area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**15. RECREATION.** Would the proposal:

a. Increase the demand for neighborhood or regional parks or other recreational facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. Affect existing recreational opportunities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**III. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE**

A. Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of rare or endangered plants or animals, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
B. Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
C. Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**IV. EARLIER ANALYSIS**

Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, one of more effect have been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or Negative Declaration [State CEQA guidelines Section 15063(c)(3)(D)]. In this case a discussion should identify the following on attached sheets.

A. **Earlier analyses used.** Identify earlier analyses and state where they are available for review.

**ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES**

(see attachments for information sources)

No Impact	Less Than Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Potentially Significant Impact
-----------	------------------------------------	--	--------------------------------------

- B. **Impacts adequately addressed.** Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of, and adequately analyzed in, an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards. Also, state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
- C. **Mitigation measures.** For effects that are checked as “Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated,” describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.

Authority: Public Resources Code Sections 21083 and 21087.

Reference: Public Resources Code Sections 21080(c), 21080.1, 21080.3, 21082.1, 21083, 31083.3, 21093, 21094, 21151; *Sundstrom v. County of Mendocino*, 202 Cal. App. 3d 296 (1988); *Leonoff v. Monterey Board of Supervisors*, 222 Cal. App. 3d 1337 (1990).

**V. OTHER RESPONSIBLE AND TRUSTEE AGENCIES WHOSE APPROVAL IS REQUIRED**

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> California Department of Fish and Game                  | <input type="checkbox"/> California Department of Health Services                |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> California Department of Transportation (e.g. Caltrans) | <input type="checkbox"/> California Integrated Waste Management Board            |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> California Regional Water Quality Control Board         | <input type="checkbox"/> Tahoe Regional Planning Agency                          |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> California Department of Forestry                       | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Foresthill PUD, Foresthill Elementary School |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> U.S. Army Corp of Engineers                             | District, Placer High School District, U.S. Forest                               |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service                            | Service, U.S. BLM, U.S. Bureau of Reclamation                                    |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO)               | Ca. Dept. of Parks & Rec., Ca. Office of Historic                                |
|   | Preservation, U.S. Bureau of Indian Affairs, Ca. Division of                     |
|   | Mines and Geology  |

**VI. DETERMINATION (to be completed by the Lead Agency)**

- A. I find that the proposed project is categorically exempt (Class \_\_\_\_ ) from the provisions of CEQA.
- B. I find that the proposed project **COULD NOT** have a significant effect on the environment, and a **NEGATIVE DECLARATION** will be prepared.
- C. I find that although the proposed project **COULD** have a significant effect on the environment, there **WILL NOT** be a significant effect in this case because the mitigation measures described on an attached sheet have been added to the project. A **MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION** will be prepared.
- D. I find that the proposed project is within the scope of impacts addressed in an previously adopted Negative Declaration, and that only minor technical changes and/or additions are necessary to ensure its adequacy for the project. An **ADDENDUM TO THE PREVIOUSLY-ADOPTED NEGATIVE DECLARATION** will be prepared.
- E. I find that the proposed project **MAY** have a significant effect on the environment, and an **ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT** is required (i.e. Project, Program, or Master EIR).
- F. I find that the proposed project **MAY** have a significant effect(s) on the environment, and at least one effect has not been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards. Potentially significant impacts and mitigation measures that have been adequately addressed in an earlier document are described on attached sheets (see Section IV above). An **ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT** will be prepared to address those effect(s) that remain outstanding (i.e. focused, subsequent, or supplemental EIR).
- G. I find that the proposed project is within the scope of impacts addressed in a previously certified EIR, and that some changes and/or additions are necessary, but none of the conditions requiring a Subsequent or Supplemental EIR exist. An **ADDENDUM TO THE PREVIOUSLY-CERTIFIED EIR** will be prepared.
- H. I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, all potentially significant effects: 1) have been adequately analyzed in an earlier Community Plan EIR pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to an earlier Community Plan EIR, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project. The earlier Community Plan EIR adequately analyzes that proposed project, so no additional EIR will be prepared. A **SITE SPECIFIC IMPACT STATEMENT**

(SSIS) will be prepared to address project specific issues (see CEQA Section 21083.3).



- I. I find that the proposed project is within the scope of impacts addressed in a previously-certified Program EIR, and that no new effects will occur nor new mitigation measures are required. Potentially significant impacts and mitigation measures that have been adequately addressed in an earlier document are described on attached sheets, including applicable mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project (see Section IV above.) **NO FURTHER ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENT** will be prepared [see CEQA Guidelines, Section 15168(c)(2)].

**VII. ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW COMMITTEE (Persons/Departments Consulted):**

Dean Prigmore, Planning Department

David Price, Department of Public Works

Roger Davies, Environmental Health Services

Ann Hobbs, Air Pollution Control District

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON

\_\_\_\_\_ Date